ı	Case 22-07668 Doc 250 Filed 08/06/24 Entered 08/06/24 10:32:02 Desc Main Document Page 1 of 15
	Document Page 1 of 13
1	IN THE UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION
3	
4	
5	Platform II Lawndale, LLC,) No. 22 B 07668
6) Chicago, Illinois) 1:15 p.m.
7	Debtor.) June 5, 2024
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE
10	HONORABLE DEBORAH L. THORNE
11	
12	APPEARANCES:
13	For the Debtor: Mr. Kevin Sterling;
14	For Greenlake: Mr. Adam Toosley;
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Prepared By: Amy Doolin, CSR, RPR U.S. Courthouse
23	219 South Dearborn Room 661
24	Chicago, IL 60604.
25	

```
Case 22-07668 Doc 250
                     Filed 08/06/24 Entered 08/06/24 10:32:02 Desc Main
                      Document
                                Page 2 of 15
                                                        2
 1
                                Platform II Lawndale, LLC.
                    THE CLERK:
 2
                   MR. TOOSLEY: Good afternoon again,
 3
    Your Honor.
                 Adam Toosley for Greenlake.
 4
                   MR. STERLING: And good afternoon,
 5
    Your Honor.
                 Kevin Sterling on behalf of Platform II
 6
    Lawndale, LLC.
 7
                    THE COURT:
                                No other appearances?
 8
                   MR. TOOSLEY:
                                  I think this is it.
 9
                   MR. STERLING:
                                   Yes.
                                         Mr. Morgan
    indicated to me earlier today that he would not be
10
11
    appearing on this case.
12
                   MR. TOOSLEY: His motion was denied
13
    originally, so that's --
14
                   So last Wednesday I did receive the
15
    February bank statements that we had talked about
16
    when we were here last time, and it did show a
17
    withdrawal after the case was dismissed, which we all
18
    knew that it existed. It didn't show necessarily who
19
    it went to or how it went to it.
20
                   But I understand based on a
21
    subsequent -- or a previous email from Mr. Sterling
22
    that there was a cashier's check issued to an
23
    investor fund generally. So based on all of that
    information, it does appear that the money was taken
24
25
    and the full amount given to the investors.
                                                   That's
```

the best that we can adduce from the information that 1 2 we now have. And it does look like that initial 3 withdrawal happened within days of the dismissal 4 order being entered. 5 So, I think they've now complied with 6 the request for the accounting in accordance with 7 Your Honor's last order. I think, you know, from our 8 perspective -- and I understand Your Honor's 9 frustration with the fact that this is still 10 pending -- I think the only issue would be whether or 11 not you would entertain an actual sanction being 12 issued for the violation, and we go about getting 13 that in front of you. 14 I don't want to do any more discovery. 15 I don't want to do anything else. I mean, I just --16 I would like to -- we have a foreclosure sale in less 17 than two weeks in the state court case. So, you 18 know, I'd like to try to wrap this up as quickly as 19 possible, and I think Your Honor would as well. 20 MR. STERLING: Well, I -- Your Honor, 21 I believe we have a fully briefed motion regarding 22 the contempt. For the reasons I stated in court last 23 time, I don't think that a contempt or a sanction 24 order is appropriate.

To the extent that Mr. Toosely's

25

client has incurred fees, they could -- arguably that 1 2 would be subsumed within the foreclosure if there was 3 a deficiency judgment. So I think piling on a 4 sanction award for the reasons I stated in my prior 5 brief and because I don't know that they are 6 foreclosed from collecting under their loan documents, I don't think it's appropriate in this 7 8 particular matter, especially considering what we 9 perceive as the non-clear mandate within the court's 10 order. 11 THE COURT: Well, I beg to differ with 12 you on that. But I guess my question is and what 13 I've tried to -- I mean, I was prepared to do an 14 order today, which I won't enter, but do you --15 Mr. Toosley, the money that went to 16 the investors -- I mean, and the reason I ordered it 17 all to go to the receiver is because I wanted the 18 receiver in the state court to figure out what was 19 rent and what was investor money. 20 And my understanding from your client 21 is that they're looking for that investor money. 22 There may have been some way back in the history of 23 this case, but that money. 24 And so are you confident that the 25 money that went to the investors was not your rents?

```
Case 22-07668 Doc 250
                     Filed 08/06/24 Entered 08/06/24 10:32:02 Desc Main
                                Page 5 of 15
                       Document
                                                         5
                    MR. TOOSLEY: No, I think it is our
 1
 2
    rents.
 3
                    THE COURT:
                                Okay.
 4
                    MR. TOOSLEY: A hundred percent
 5
    because we do have proof that there was about half of
 6
    it or so came in after the plan to fund the plan.
 7
    The other half came in as much as almost a year
 8
    before the plan was even presented to the court.
                                                        So
 9
    it couldn't have been an investment in the plan.
                                                         Ιt
10
    was to pay cash collateral.
                    And, obviously, the rents here were
11
12
    not sufficient to make adequate protection payments,
13
    so they literally took all the money that has been
14
    given to us to pay back those people who had a loan
15
    that wasn't approved by the court.
16
                    THE COURT: Right.
17
                                  So I do believe that
                    MR. TOOSLEY:
18
    somewhere around half of the amount for sure is our
19
    cash collateral. I just -- the case has been
20
    dismissed, and I'm concerned and confused as to how
    to do --
21
22
                    THE COURT:
                                Well --
23
                    MR. TOOSLEY: -- this, you know --
24
                    THE COURT: -- so this is where -- and
25
    I've spent a fair amount of time looking at this.
```

1 MR. TOOSLEY: Right.

of the debtor. He appeared throughout it. He is self-identified as the manager and the client representative. And that was in docket number 1 and docket number 228. And I recognized him, therefore, as the person in control under Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9001(5).

So, the order I entered — and I have the authority under Section 105 of the Bankruptcy Code to enforce my orders. And the Seventh Circuit and the Supreme Court of the United States have been quite clear that I have the authority to enforce my order. My order was that all of the funds in the debtor's account as of the date of my dismissal be turned over to the state court receiver. They weren't.

Now, the reason I wanted the accounting and that I thought that Greenlake was entitled to it was to know what that money was. How much, what it was. If Greenlake subsequently felt that the money turned over was investor funds that they weren't making a claim to, sobeit. But that's why I wanted the accounting.

Now, I'm gathering from what you're

saying is you've kind of gotten the accounting. At least got bank statements to see what money left.

MR. TOOSLEY: Correct.

THE COURT: But my order was all the money be turned over. And I still have jurisdiction to do that, to enforce that. I think that's very clear. So we don't have that answer. I don't think there needs to be a lot of discovery. We need to know where that money came from and where it went back to.

It's like I said, I think we could do this in an afternoon if we saw the bank statements and where it went. I mean, I don't think there — we're not talking about something that needs a lot of discovery from either side. It was rents or it wasn't rents. And, actually, I wanted the state court to figure that out.

MR. STERLING: Your Honor, if I may, in our response brief, pursuant to the first time that I appeared before Your Honor on this matter, Your Honor directed us to identify the sources of the money. And we did that within the context of our response. We provided detailed records, including the dates on which the deposits came in from the investors and back-up showing where those deposits

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

measuring date of what funds on the date that the receiver was appointed. It doesn't say all funds as of the dismissal. It just says upon appointment of the receiver all funds held in any of the debtor's bank accounts.

THE COURT: So I know the moment I entered that order the debtor moved the money. That was not in the spirit of the order. We've had this argument before.

MR. STERLING: Okay.

THE COURT: My order said all funds held by the debtor. I didn't mean to have some kind

of splicing so, okay, I've got two days or three days
before the receiver comes. I'm going to take all the
money. That was not — this case was one that I have
had — I could be criticized for having way too much
patience and allowing it to exist as long as I did in
this court. I think Mr. Toosley could be criticized

for allowing it to happen so long in this court.

But at any rate, the idea was the debtor has money today. I'm dismissing the case. I want the state court and the receiver to make sure. And I think it was quite clear. Mr. Krone was here. And if he ran out went to the bank to start issuing checks to the investors, that was certainly in violation of my order.

And I understand where you're coming from, but I want to ask Mr. Toosley a couple of questions.

MR. TOOSLEY: Sure.

THE COURT: I mean, I'm very happy to end this case if he's got everything he needs and if you want to fight it down the street. No problem with that.

But at this point, I don't feel that my order was complied with, and I am ready to hold Mr. Krone in contempt for failure to do that. And

1 | the penalty for that would be at least to pay Mr.

2 Toosely's legal fees from the date of that order

through the present and going on. And I would retain

4 jurisdiction.

Now, maybe that's not necessary. I mean, I don't know, Mr. Toosely, how hard you — whether you feel like you've gotten information to know what were rents and what were investor funds. And if you want to fight that down the street, I am very happy to have the judge take care of it down there. But I do feel that my order was violated.

MR. TOOSLEY: And I agree with you entirely. I think the answer is still — there's a legal component to it, right? They have just unilaterally assigned this as an investor fund when, as we identified in our briefs, this isn't an investor fund when you needed it to pay our adequate protection because the rents weren't.

So to me there's a factual component as far as where this money went that I still don't know as we sit here today only because it was written to just random PIIC Investor Fund that Mr. Krone can identify in a short period of time in front of Your Honor. But also I think the — if Your Honor didn't want to do this originally, which is everything we're

1 talking about, having the judge there do it 2 potentially, it's not -- in our argument it's not 3 investor funds unless it happened in November or 4 December. It's rents. It's all -- they took it out 5 of the rents to pay -- it was originally paid to us, 6 so we're kind of being double hit with this by having 7 to allow them to pay back people who loaned money to 8 the company without getting a court order to do so. 9 So, I think there is a factual 10 component that we don't entirely know where this went 11 because it's just a random cashier's check to PIIC 12 Investors. But, also, I don't believe that at least 13 the things that happened in 2022 are plan investor 14 money. It's not. 15 So, I think there is a legal component 16 to it as well. So, to me it's not as 17 straightforward. It's just because we designated and 18 decided to call it plan investor money, it's plan 19 investor money, which is what they're trying to get 20 Your Honor to do. 21 THE COURT: I mean, the debtor was in 22 violation of the cash collateral orders that were my orders all the way through this case. I still have 23 24 jurisdiction to enforce those orders. If you want to take a look at this in terms of similar cases before 25

- 1 | the Bankruptcy Court for Northern District of
- 2 | Illinois, you may want to take a look at In re Direct
- 3 Media, which was a Judge Barnes case. It was
- 4 appealed to the district court. And there that was a
- 5 cash collateral order all the way through, issues.
- 6 And some of the similar arguments were made there, as
- 7 here.
- 8 I guess, Mr. Toosely, I'm looking for
- 9 some guidance from you.
- 10 MR. TOOSLEY: I would say we can do
- 11 | this in an hour easily if Your Honor had a time.
- 12 THE COURT: We'll just set it for a
- 13 hearing.
- MR. TOOSLEY: Yeah.
- 15 THE COURT: Let's figure it out.
- 16 MR. TOOSLEY: So even on the 26th if
- 17 | you had it at the end of your call when I'm here on
- 18 | the last case, too, but I don't know if that date
- 19 works.
- 20 THE COURT: Let me just look at my
- 21 | calendar and make sure I don't have some meeting or
- 22 something that afternoon.
- 23 MR. TOOSLEY: It sounds like there is
- 24 a concern.
- 25 THE COURT: It's wide open. Why don't

```
Filed 08/06/24 Entered 08/06/24 10:32:02 Desc Main
   Case 22-07668 Doc 250
                               Page 13 of 15
                      Document
                                                         13
 1
    we set it for 2:00 o'clock on the 26th.
 2
                    MR. STERLING: Your Honor, I'm in
 3
    state court.
 4
                    THE COURT:
                                Okay.
 5
                    MR. STERLING: And I know the next
 6
    week is the 4th of July.
 7
                                I'm out that week.
                    THE COURT:
8
                    MR. TOOSLEY:
                                  So we'd have to do it
9
    the 10th, right?
                    MR. STERLING: I believe, Your Honor,
10
11
    the 10th is a full day for you.
12
                    THE COURT: No, but it's just a motion
13
    call, but, I mean, I think the motion call will be
14
    over by say 2:30 or I could actually do it on -- yes,
15
    2:30 on July 10th.
16
                    MR. TOOSLEY:
                                  Sounds great.
17
                                I think Mr. Krone should
                    THE COURT:
18
    be present. And if he has -- they should be here
19
    because I am -- you know, this is a -- I think under
20
    9001(5) is clearly the person that has -- I mean,
21
    corporations don't usually have mouths. They operate
22
    through people, and that's what 9001(5) is saying.
23
                    So I'll see everybody at 2:30 on the
24
    10th.
25
                    MR. TOOSLEY:
                                  Okay.
```

```
Case 22-07668 Doc 250
                      Filed 08/06/24 Entered 08/06/24 10:32:02 Desc Main
                                Page 14 of 15
                      Document
                                                          14
                    MR. STERLING: You're ordering
 1
 2
    Mr. Krone to appear?
 3
                    THE COURT: Yes. I assume the parties
 4
    can talk if there are any other witnesses.
 5
                    MR. TOOSLEY:
                                   I don't think there is.
                    THE COURT: So July 10th at 10:00 --
 6
 7
    2:30, excuse me.
8
                    MR. TOOSLEY: Our summer associates
 9
    are here as well, so I brought them with.
10
                    THE COURT: I have my externs, too.
                    July 10th is wide open.
11
12
                    MR. TOOSLEY: All right. Thank you
13
    very much, Your Honor. Have a great holiday.
14
                    MR. STERLING:
                                    Thank you.
15
                    (End of Audio Recording.)
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

	Case 22-07668 Doc 250 Filed 08/06/24 Entered 08/06/24 10:32:02 Desc Main
	Document Page 15 of 15
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	CERTIFICATE
6	
7	I, AMY DOOLIN, CSR, RPR, do hereby
8	certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate
9	transcription of proceedings electronically recorded
10	on June 5, 2024, submitted to D&E Reporting for
11	transcription, and contains all the content contained
12	in said recording and has been transcribed to the
13	best of my ability.
14	
15	/s/Amy Doolin, CSR, RPR
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23 24	
24 25	